

CYNTHIA HUCKELBERRY  
1400 Barton Road #2104  
Redlands, CA 92373  
909-307-0614

Ms. Cathy Poncabare  
California Performance Review Board  
Sacramento, CA

August 18, 2004

Dear Cathy Poncabare,

It was a pleasure speaking with you yesterday morning. I want to thank you for allowing me the opportunity to forward this report to the Commission. This paper reveals the negative impact that Child Protective Services has inflicted upon many families within the county of San Bernardino.

As I stated before, I obtained case information through referrals from Congressman Baca's office, via "word of mouth", and by placing an ad in the local newspaper. Fifty-five families responded, a total of one hundred thirty-five children were placed in Foster Care. Through the utilization of Child Protective Service's codes, policy and procedure manuals, I found that only two cases out of the fifty-five cases met C.P.S. criteria for removal. The majority of the cases mainly needed services and assistance with some aspect pertaining to life experiences. Unfortunately in the majority of situations, Child Protective Services dramatically overreacted, similar to killing a mosquito with a sledgehammer.

The basic cost to house a child in Foster Care is \$30,000 annually; less medical, psychological and special need services. This amount does not include stipends paid to foster care parents, nor monies required to facilitate the removal and monitoring process of these children. Thus, the utmost basic cost allotted to house these children within the

Foster Care System is \$1,650,000. This dollar amount does not include the human costs that these children have needlessly incurred through Child Protective Services' negative impact.

In addition to state monies, the Federal Government provides matching funds to supplement states costs. Let it also be noted that Riverside County Child Protective Service Agency's investigation caseload amounts to 20% of intakes, where San Bernardino County's is that of 60%-85%.

Thus I have come to the conclusion, that San Bernardino County Child Protective Service Agency needlessly removes children from predominantly poor, undereducated families, in attempts to increase their budget. Further information provided within my paper, will reveal numerous issues, that when confronted, supports these beliefs.

Please provide a copy of this letter with each study, so as to provide a greater understanding of the financial aspect.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Huckelberry, RN, MA

Revised July 27, 2004

Cynthia Huckelberry, RN, MA  
1400 Barton Road  
P.O. Box 2104  
Redlands, CA 92373  
Phone (909) 307-0614  
Email: cynthiahuckelberry@hotmail.com

July 12, 2004

United States House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515-0542

To our honorable United States House of Representatives,

It is unfortunate that Child Protective Service officials have mislead the government into believing, that increased funding is necessary to solve the multitude of problems that encompass C.P.S. This agency is utilizing the funding issue as the scapegoat for their problems, when in actuality the workers themselves, the lack of their personal accountability, are the source of the problem. Further funding will not solve Child Protective Service's current crisis, only the restructuring of this agency will provide a solution.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Huckelberry, RN, MA

Enclosure (8)

## **OVERVIEW OF NEGATIVE IMPACT RELATED TO THE CURRENT CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE PROGRAM/REVISED:**

Child Protective Services was designed to protect children and aid families that are in need of assistance in order to maintain the family unit.

Unfortunately, today we are finding that C.P.S is targeting specific families with limited set budgets, where child removal is commonly practiced for their personal financial gain. The dispassionate behavior exhibited by caseworkers towards the impoverished families they serve promotes further devaluation of their lives. Due to Child Protective Services' lack of understanding and caring related to the circumstances of these financially challenged families, this stereotyping creates further dissention, thereby resulting in prejudice decisions.

Within this document, the information provided will serve as an insight into the true source of the problems that plagues Child Protective Service today. Also, it will provide possible solutions that may be utilized to best serve a new restructured Child Protective Service Agency.

## **HOW CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE LEGALLY REMOVES CHILDREN FORM PARENTAL CUSTODY**

Child Protective Service systematically removes children from their families, who do not meet the criteria for removal, through vague and ambiguous interpretation of their own codes, policies and procedures. They are able to operate in this manner, by selecting specific target groups.

The target groups that Child Protective Service has tagged are the poor, disabled, elderly, and the undereducated. Parents/guardians unfamiliar with the law, with limited or no financial means to secure impartial unbiased legal representation, blindly trust C.P.S and the courts. Therefore Child Protective Service is able to manipulate the court system to secure foster care or adoption status of these children for profit.

**Example:** Each child placed in foster care has an annual value of \$30,000. More monies are available, up to \$150,000 dollars per child, for those that meet the special needs criteria. After 24 months- during the concurrent foster care /adoption process, placement becomes final, where upon an \$8,000 dollar bonus is dispersed to the county from the State. This bonus money is then divided amongst individuals that enable the adoption process to be

completed, even though this is not necessarily a positive solution for these children. Thus, this leads us to believe that some of the decisions made by C.P.S officials serve only as a means to enhance the caseworkers' personal budgets.

### **CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE INTENTIONALLY UNDERMINES THE FAMILY REUNIFICATION PROCESS**

After the children are removed from their home, Child Protective Service must create a plan for family reunification that is designed to reassemble the family unit. Unfortunately, current C.P.S case plans promote the families' failure in various ways. These case plans do not allow the parents the time needed to comply nor do they have the financial resources needed to meet the court assigned criteria. Unbeknownst to the families, the courts, lawyers, and C.P.S workers falsely interject foster care criteria when family criteria should be utilized. Caseworkers may also place long-term program demands on the parents that purposely overrun the 24-month time period. This then allows the state to complete the adoption process since foster care/adoption run concurrently, unsuspected by the parents.

### **FAMILY COURT CUSTODY REMOVAL - PARENT ALIENATION SYNDROME**

Let it be known, that Family Court officials regularly remove custody of children from one parent to another (usually mother to father), citing parent alienation syndrome. C.P.S agrees to serve as the tool to enable custody transfer, a corrupt process observed by the FBI. Where, in truth, caseworkers are never allowed to testify in family court under the cloak of C.P.S authority, due to possible misuse or conflict of interest related to the right to privacy laws. FBI Agent/Lawyer Brenda Atkinson- San Francisco can verify this information by calling her at (415) 553-7400.

### **VARIOUS MALICIOUS MANEUVERS**

Child Protective Service also submits false documentation so as to provide a supportive basis necessary to substantiate their decisions. Thus the truth is purposely obstructed altered or omitted to justify case plans.

In many cases, C.P.S has failed to investigate additional outside reports from various professionals and agencies such as children's physicians, police agencies, school system, etc.

In other cases, failure to protect –WIC 300b was cited to obtain removal of the children, when the custodial parents acted protectively, in accordance to the law, after a crime was committed against one of their children. Currently all children from these cases remain in “protective custody” under the authority of C.P.S.

### **CPS SYSTEMATICALLY REMOVES CHILDREN FROM THEIR FAMILIES TO INCREASE CURRENT AND FUTURE BUDGETS**

Since President Clinton enacted the Adoption and Safe Families act in 1997, this has lead to widespread corruption within the Child Protective Services Agency and outlying neighboring agencies. By systematically removing children from predominantly poor families, C.P.S is able to secure foster care/adoption status for these children with little or no parental encumbrance.

Since Federal and State matching funds generate the budget for Child Protective Service, the single means utilized by officials to enhance the budget, has been to increase the number of foster care/adoption case load.

Thus, Child Protective Service victimizes those families that have no means available, to properly investigate C.P.S corrupt activities directed at their family.

Bonus incentives for adoptions are currently \$8,000 per child. \$4,000 is given to the foster parents and another \$4,000 is placed in a general fund designed to reward workers for completing job duties. Caseworkers in San Bernardino County, California, those who were questioned, stated that they do not personally benefit from this fund. Thus it leads us to believe, that other neighboring agencies are benefiting financially from this fund, in exchange for documents that support Child Protective Service deceptive practices.

**Example:** Grandparents unwilling to become foster care parents to their grandchildren, eventually adopting, are automatically removed from preferred status. The children are then placed with other family members or

strangers willing to accept monies from Child Protective Service. This maneuver is utilized only as a method to enhance C.P.S' budget. Individuals unwilling to accept state funding are automatically disqualified indefinitely solely based on refusal of state assistance. The reason behind this is that once children are adopted, C.P.S receives annual funding for each child until they are 18 years of age.

## **BABY TRAFFICKING**

Child Protective Service manufactures false allegations of drug abuse against mothers as a means to remove their newborn infants from the hospital placing them into protective custody. The abduction of newborn infants is commonly practiced by caseworkers who pose as adoption agency workers to new adoptive parents. C.P.S is mandated to secure verification of drug allegations via blood and urine test results, prior to removing the newborn infant from the hospital. However, in some instances, caseworkers remove newborn infants prior to verification. Upon discharge from the hospital, mothers present documentation of negative test results to Child Protective Service only to be told that they would never see their infants again, that the adoption process had begun. All cases known to our study, drug testing resulted negative for the mother and the newborn, but these infants were never returned, and were adopted outside of kinship.

In the past year, the FBI has arrested and imprisoned C.P.S workers who were actively involved in baby trafficking for profit. These C.P.S workers knowingly abducted infants from the hospital where they in turn networked them into legal adoption agencies. Augustus Fennerty, FBI director for Crimes against Children (Washington D.C) can verify this information. Please contact him at (202) 324-3000.

## **CHILD SEX TRADE INDUSTRY**

Southern California FBI District has videotape recorded Child Protective Service workers placing foster care children onto planes via LAX, destination Europe for Child Sex Trade Industry. It is understood that these caseworkers are utilizing the foster children as a form of commerce in relation to this industry. This can be verified through Ted Gunderson, (retired) FBI Director Southern California. Please contact him at (310) 477-6565.

## **SEXUAL VICTIMIZATION IN FOSTER CARE**

For the families in relation to our group in San Bernardino County, it has come to our attention while comparing similarities, that approximately half the children in foster care have been molested.

These children were not sexually abused by their parents, but by the foster fathers or others in the foster home. It was also noted that these foster homes are still operating in the same capacity prior to complaints, without any investigation into these allegations. Child Protective Service officials were made aware of these accusations by the children, but failed to follow through with a criminal investigation.

In conclusion, Child Protective Service is nothing more than an “oasis” for child molesters. The individuals financially profit while committing a crime, only to be protected by a malignant system that delivers a never ending supply of children for sexual victimization. Until Child Protective Service is restructured, this perverse system will continue to disregard the safety of the very children they were designed to protect.

## **SYSTEMATIC FRAUDULENT MANEUVERS UTILIZED TO ENHANCE C.P.S BUDGET**

- C.P.S manufactures multiple nonexistent /fictitious abuse case scenarios to offset true statistical abuse case information.
- C.P.S concurrently processes these children from foster care to adoption, in order to obtain perverse monetary incentives in the form of bonuses.
- C.P.S provides a market to neighboring agencies and the courts (commissioners, psychologists, monitors, court mandated behavioral class instructors, court appointed legal counsel), in order for them to financially benefit from the foster care/adoption system.
- C.P.S victimizes innocent impoverished families, draws them into a corrupt system to utilize their children as pawns for commerce.



## **MALICIOUS OPERATIVE TECHNIQUES**

- C.P.S is utilized by family court officials, as an adverse tool to extricate children from one parent to the other, with reference to “parent alienation syndrome”. Where, in truth, caseworkers are never allowed to testify in family court under the cloak of C.P.S authority, due to possible misuse or conflict of interest related to the right to privacy laws.
- C.P.S utilizes coercive measures to persuade parents to submit to statements of nonexistent abuse. In other words, forcing desperate parents to “plea bargain” to a C.P.S fabricated crime, for the return of their children from foster care.
- C.P.S fabricates portions of investigations to purposely mislead or misdirect a case.
- C.P.S knowingly abandons children into the foster care system, conscious that some individuals in these homes, physically and/or sexually abuse those in their protective custody.
- C.P.S intentionally fails to prosecute parents accused of child abuse, since in the majority of cases, no initial crime has been committed.
- C.P.S represents themselves in positive personas, by omitting, altering, and falsifying documents, so as to mislead the public and or government of their true actions as listed above. Thereby publicly grandstanding, displaying an inaccurate social martyrdom for the well being of children.
- C.P.S ignores crimes committed in foster care through failure to investigate.
- C.P.S fails to question these individuals for their abusive conduct, whereby, if it were not a foster care parent, these individuals would be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

## **SHOULD CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE BE RESTRUCTURED**

The police should determine if a child has a true need for protection from his parents, since child abuse is a criminal offense. When positioning C.P.S within a police agency, this merge streamlines and combines the best attributes of both agencies. Thus, C.P.S should be incorporated with Crimes against Children Units that are currently located within police, sheriffs and FBI agencies.

The merging of the two would reduce the amount of false allegations reported, since complaints made to a police unit is a criminal offence. Also, the police have the training and resources needed to conduct a thorough investigation. This allows them to determine that if a crime has been committed that warrants the need for foster care.

A parent/guardian under the suspicion of the crime “Child Abuse” would meet the criteria for removal, activating the foster care system. Only then would the foster care system be utilized as a response to an actual or suspected crime.

Thus in turn, this would eliminate the unnecessary utilization of the foster care system which has been grossly misused in the past. Further a noticeable reduction of unwarranted cases would be realized, while containing soaring costs, minimizing the number of future cases that fall through the cracks and get lost in the system.

### **WHAT ROLE SHOULD THE SOCIAL WORKERS PLAY IN THE NEW CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE**

- All caseworkers must have a bachelor’s degree in social work from an accredited college.
- All states must create bachelor level licensing for social workers.
- All workers must have a current license to work within any state or county in the United States with reciprocity.
- All social workers must have a preceptor for at least three months prior to individual casework.

### **WHO SHOULD BE A MEMBER OF THE CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE TEAM WITHIN THE CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN UNITS**

Other members from various agencies should be inclusive to this unit, since they bring their specific expertise to complete a proper investigation. It is our opinion that the following individuals who should comprise this team are as stated: Registered Nurse, School Principal, Detective, and Social Worker.

**SHOULD AN OUTSIDE AGENCY SYSTEMATICALLY REVIEW THE CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICE TEAM'S PERFORMANCE**

All agencies must have an outside quality control board that monitors case investigations on a random basis and when requested by the public. This Board must include members similar to the Child Protective Service team, with the addition of an individual from the public. No member may be employed more than three years, to maintain the integrity of the boards' unbiased decisions.

**SHOULD WE MAINTAIN A CHILD ABUSE INDEX LIST**

The child abuse index list shall be maintained only when an individual has been prosecuted and convicted by a court of law for a crime against a child. Today's said list shall be destroyed, so as to prevent harm to those currently listed who have been accused of a crime against a child, but that have never been prosecuted or convicted. And, children should never be placed on any list that would categorize them in an adverse manner, such as this.

**SHOULD THERE BE NEW RULES AND REGULATIONS RELATED TO FOSTER CARE**

There should be a limited number of children allowed to be placed in any single home under foster care, including adoption. No single family shall be allowed to adopt or provide foster care to more than two children at any time. The only exception shall be when siblings number more than two and are placed in the same single dwelling. This will eliminate the financial incentive for monetary gain related to housing foster children and adoptions.

**THE FOLLOWING REPORT WAS SUBMITTED BY:**

CYNTHIA HUCKELBERRY  
1400 BARTON RD  
P.O BOX 2104  
REDLANDS, CALIF. 92373  
PHONE (909) 307-0614  
Email: cynthiahuckelberry@hotmail.com